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ABSTRACT
For some time now there has been an urgent need for a new reference grammar for the Greek New Testament, utilising the insights of recent developments in linguistics and semantics. In the same way as the Louw-Nida Lexicon utilised these insights with reference to lexical units, the new grammar should utilise them with reference to larger units of text (i.e. word, proposition, sentence, sentence cluster, paragraphs, chapter, book). It should move from a traditional morphologically-based syntactic approach to a syntactic-based semantic approach. In this article different aspects of a possible methodology for a part of such a grammar are explored. The necessity for a new grammar is indicated (1); various theoretical linguistic points of departure are discussed (2); the state of the art concerning Greek reference grammars is ascertained, and the methodology of different grammars compared (3); exploratory remarks concerning the approach in such a new grammar are made (4). The article closes with a possible scheme for the relevant part of the envisaged grammar (5), and a summary of research which needs to be done (6).

1 THE NECESSITY FOR A NEW GRAMMAR

In many circles it is deemed unnecessary to investigate Greek grammar because—so it is argued—all of the major problems were solved in the 19th century. Porter (1991:203) convincingly points out that this assertion usually reveals a lack of, inter alia, awareness of developments in the field of modern linguistics.

For more than a decade different New Testament and Greek scholars have pointed out that there is an urgent need for a new reference grammar which utilises the results of recent research in the fields of linguistics and semantics, as succinctly indicated by Porter (1991:202-208). This need does not merely comprise a linguistic revision of a present standard grammar, but implies a totally...
new approach and methodology\textsuperscript{1}. In the same way that the Louw-Nida Lexicon utilises the new insights with reference to lexical units (words and idioms), the relevant section of such a new grammar should utilise these insights with reference to larger units of text (i.e., word, proposition, sentence, sentence cluster, paragraphs, chapter, book).

2 THEORETICAL LINGUISTIC POINTS OF DEPARTURE

Stanley E Porter, in his article ‘Keeping up with recent studies: Greek language and linguistics’ suggests five points that should be considered when discussing the grammar of Greek (1991:206-207):

1. New theories with higher descriptive and explanatory powers should be utilised.
2. The test of any hypothesis is not that it resolves all doubts but that it offers the most consistent explanation.
3. Hellenistic Greek should be studied in its own right, and the phenomenon of bilingualism should be taken into consideration.
4. The peculiarities of a purely epigraphic language should be taken into consideration.
5. The difference between the items found in the Greek and a translation into another language for analysis must be considered.

In addition to these suggestions (which I support entirely), I wish to add the following as points of departure.

2.1 A descriptive approach

From the outset the approach of the grammar should not be diachronic, but synchronic. The focus should therefore not be on the historical development of, say, a certain grammatical construction, but on the function of the construction in the texts of the New Testament.

2.2 An etic approach

The approach of the grammar should be etic and not emic. It should therefore not be based upon the typical first century linguistic presuppositions, but the Greek of the different books in the New Testament should be described in terms of present-day models.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1} Porter (1991:202) is correct in stating that ‘the role of language in New Testament exegesis is much greater than simply correcting a few abuses.’ He also states that ‘most ancient languages are greatly understudied, since the results of “modern” linguistic study have not yet been applied to them’.

\textsuperscript{2} I agree with Porter (1991:206) that the fact that the Greek of the New Testament is an-
2.3 A reference grammar
The book should be a reference grammar, and not a merely theoretical study of the Greek of the different New Testament books. It must have the specific practical intention of serving as a work of reference for persons who wish to—from the Greek—interpret the New Testament books. It should therefore be a Greek Grammar for New Testament exegesis.

2.4 Orientation towards the interpretation of texts
The aim of the grammar should not be a description of the Greek in order to enable persons to generate new texts in this language. Rather, the aim should be to serve as aid in the linguistic interpretation of the already existing complete corpus of texts comprising the New Testament. This orientation has important implications for the approach and composition of the grammar, and these implications must be completely accounted for when selecting an approach and method.

2.5 The semantic nature of the approach and composition
The praxis for which the grammar is intended, is the linguistic interpretation of the Greek New Testament. This has two implications: firstly, that it should assist the reader in ascertaining the probable meaning of the relevant text for the first readers; and, secondly that it should assist in communicating this original meaning in a responsible and appropriate manner to a present-day society with its unique but nevertheless related problems.

Traditional morphological and syntactic data should be included in the grammar, but—and this should be one of the main differences between it and existing grammars—the principle of division and order in which the data is presented should not be determined on morphological-syntactic grounds, but on syntactic-semantic grounds.

2.6 Unique features of the New Testament texts
The corpus of texts grouped together as the New Testament exhibits certain characteristics which should be accounted for in the composition of the grammar. The following two characteristics are the most important:

2.6.1 No homogeneous Greek
The different books of the New Testament exhibit no homogeneous linguistic character. For instance, it is not possible to speak about New Testament Greek as if it comprises a certain kind of Greek. The books of the New Testament came into existence over too long a period of time, and—in linguistic terms—there are too many individual authors with, in many cases, divergent backgrounds. When
one takes into consideration the whole phenomenon of bilingualism and even multilingualism in first century societies, the issue becomes even more complex.

It is therefore in a way an artificial attempt to endeavour to generalise the features of this collection of documents. The implications of this lack of homogeneity for the grammar must be determined and made explicit at the outset of the project.

2.6.2 The local character of Hellenistic Greek
A factor which is closely related to the phenomenon that the books of the New Testament do not exhibit a homogeneous Greek, is the local character of Hellenistic Greek. Although Greek was *lingua franca* in the era of the origin of the New Testament documents, the language itself exhibits no homogeneous character, as a study of the documents clearly indicates. From region to region there were unique characteristics pertaining to the whole spectrum of the language.

3 GREEK REFERENCE GRAMMARS: THE STATE OF THE ART

Krugér (1975:113-117) provides a useful survey of the different grammars. He lists eighteen such works, the earliest of which is the work by Salomon Glassius, published between 1623-1636. The most recent one mentioned in his survey is the book by A Springhetti, which was published in 1966. Krugér (1975:115,116) typifies the grammar of Blass-Debrunner-Funk (1961) as 'the grammar of the New Testament today'. This grammar is one of the most widely used reference grammars. This is also the case in South Africa. The seventeenth German edition follows the same approach and presentation of data. In my assessment of the state of the art, the Blass-Debrunner-Funk edition is therefore taken as point of departure and forms the basis of comparison.

3.1 The approach of Blass-Debrunner-Funk (1961)
Blass-Debrunner-Funk (1961) begin with an *Introduction* (p 1-6), covering the following topics: *New Testament Greek, The Koine, and The place of the NT within Hellenistic Greek*. This is followed by three parts: Part 1 covers *Phonology* in 18 pages, Part 2 covers *Accidence and word-formation* in 45 pages, and Part 3 covers *Syntax* in about 200 pages.

---

3 This grammar has a long history. The original book by Friedrich Blass, *Grammatik des neustamentlichen Griechisch der Öffentlichkeit* was published in 1896. The fourth edition, revised by Albert Debrunner, followed in 1913. 1959 saw the tenth edition, and 1990 the seventeenth edition, with Friedrich Rehkopf as reviser/editor. Back in 1898 it was translated into English by Thackeray, with a second edition in 1905. In 1961 Robert W. Funk translated and revised the ninth/tenth German edition, incorporating supplementary notes by Debrunner.
3.1.1 Phonology
The phonology section is dealt with cursorily. Whether phonology deserves a place at all in the envisaged grammar is an open question. The orientation of the envisaged grammar, especially the focus on the interpretation rather than the generating of texts, seems to render the inclusion of phonology superfluous.

3.1.2 Accidence and word-formation
The composition of Part 2 (Accidence and word-formation) manifests the particular deficiency that it is not clear what the principle of division is. This part comprises the following six sections:

1 Declension p. 25-35
2 Conjugation p. 36-55
3 Adverbs p. 55-57
4 Particles p. 57-58
5 Word-formation p. 58-67
6 Vocabulary p. 68-69

This approach is not the most effective one when the primary goal is the interpretation of a text. If the goal is a mere theoretical study of the language, or if it focuses on the acquisition of an ability to generate texts, the approach does have merit. Much of the data in Blass-Debrunner-Funk (1961) must, to my mind, be included in the envisaged grammar. The goal of this grammar will, however, determine the order in which the material is to be presented.

3.1.3 Syntax
An overview of the subjects which Blass-Debrunner-Funk (1961) discusses in Part 3 leaves the impression of a potpourri. The following 15 themes are discussed:

1 Subject and predicate p. 70-72
2 Agreement p. 72-76
3 The use of gender and number p. 76-79
4 Syntax of the cases p. 79-110
5 Syntax of prepositions p. 110-125
6 Syntax of adjectives p. 125-129
7 Syntax of numerals p. 129-131
8 The article p. 131-145
9 Syntax of pronouns p. 145-161
10 Syntax of the verb p. 161-220
11 Adverbs and particles p. 220-239
12 Sentence structure p. 239-248
13 Word and clause order p. 248-253
14 Ellipsis, Brachylogy, Pleonasm p. 253-256
15 Figures of speech p. 256-264

Blass-Debrunner-Funk (1961) do not provide their own explicit definition of syntax. The premise is, however, probably the same as that described by Funk in a later publication (1977:1,68): ‘Syntax...has to do with the function of words and word groups in relation to each other and to the whole.’ Blass-Debrunner-Funk (1961:70) often refer to Robertson (1923) and Smyth (1956), which im-
plies that their definitions of syntax are probably accepted. These definitions indicate that—to a lesser or larger extent—the focus remains on relations, but without a clear grid being employed. In the first section (par 1-3) different intra-sentence relations and formations are taken as points of departure; then (par 4) the cases are discussed; subsequently (par 5-11) different parts of speech are discussed, followed by facets of sentence structure (par 12-13). The discussion is concluded with different facets of 'stylistics' (par 14-15). In the light of the present state of the art with regard to these matters paragraphs 12-15 in any case constitute a rather neglected and skimpy treatment of very important facets of a grammar.

3.2 A comparison of three grammars
To place the need for a new reference grammar in historic perspective, it is necessary to present a synopsis of three of the most important reference grammars, viz Winer (1870)5, the four volumes by Moulton & Turner (1908, 1929, 1963, 1976), and Blass-Debrunner-Funk (1961). The latter is taken as point of departure.

A comparison of Blass-Debrunner-Funk, Winer, and Moulton & Turner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blass-Debrunner-Funk (262 pp)</th>
<th>Winer (793 pp)</th>
<th>Moulton &amp; Turner (1151 pp)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong> (6 pp)</td>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong> (11 pp)</td>
<td><strong>Prolegomena</strong> (41 pp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Testament Greek</td>
<td>Object, treatment and history of NT grammar</td>
<td>General characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Koine</td>
<td></td>
<td>History of 'common' Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT within Hellenistic Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td>The rest of the Prolegomena (pp57-290) consists of a synoptic treatment of the noun, the verb, and the infinitive and participle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phonology</strong> (18 pp)</td>
<td>Orthography (13 pp)</td>
<td>Sounds and writing (116 pp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthography, sound changes, and transliteration of foreign words</td>
<td></td>
<td>The alphabet; punctuation; sounds and orthography</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Robertson's (1923:384) definition reads: 'Syntax...treats of the binding of words together in all relations'. Later (1923:444) he says: 'syntax is the minute examination of the relations of words...the relations of clause with clause.' Smyth (1963:255) gives the following definition: 'Syntax (οὐστασ—arranging together) shows how different parts of speech and their different inflectional forms are employed to form sentences.'

5 I used the 1870 edition, translated into English by WF Moulton from the sixth German edition. In the foreword Moulton states that he adhered very closely to the original, adding about one sixth to the data, and abridging the German version in some places.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accidence and word-formation (45 pp)</th>
<th>Accidence (82 pp)</th>
<th>Accidence (150 pp)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declension and conjugation</td>
<td>Forms of nouns, verbs and adjectives;</td>
<td>The article, nouns, adjectives, verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs and particles</td>
<td>Formation of words</td>
<td>Word-formation (142 pp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-formation and vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Word composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Word composition by suffixes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntax (195 pp)</th>
<th>Syntax (671 pp)</th>
<th>Syntax (350 pp)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intra-sentence relations (9 pp)</td>
<td>Import and use of different parts of speech (514 pp)</td>
<td>1 Analytical syntax (270 pp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cases (31 pp)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Word material for sentence building (140 pp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parts of speech (129 pp)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Word groups defining a noun or adjective (70 pp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Word material which defines a verb (70 pp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence structure, word and clause order (14 pp)</td>
<td>Structure of sentences, and the combination of sentences into periods (157 pp)</td>
<td>2 Synthetic syntax (160 pp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipsis, brachylogy, pleonasm (3 pp)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple sentence (40 pp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures of speech (9 pp)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Connections between sentences (21 pp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The style of the different NT books (160 pp)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comparison shows, amongst others, the following:

1. Winer's approach is to a large extent duplicated by the two more recent grammars. This especially holds true for Blass-Debrunner-Funk.

2. Turner's treatment of the syntax shows a deviation from the traditional approach in important aspects, viz. the attempt to make relations the starting point. He does not, however, utilise a clear grid of possible relations. He works with two categories of relations, viz those between word groups and nouns/adjectives, and those between word groups and verbs. He also devotes specific attention to connections between sentences.

3. The Style section of Turner (1976) is also unique. However, he once again does not use a specific model. Rather it is an ad hoc description of different 'stylistic' facets of the different books of the New Testament.

This is obviously no exhaustive discussion of the three grammars, but provides the necessary background for the exploratory remarks on a methodology for the relevant part of the envisaged grammar.
4 EXPLORATORY REMARKS ON THE APPROACH

4.1 Theoretical section
The grammar should start with an enunciation of the model(s) with which it operates. In this introduction it should be stated that the approach is syntactic-semantic, and that the goal of the grammar is to be an interpretational aid, and that it is not intended to aid or develop the ability to generate texts.

The rest of this article investigates the possibilities of the suggested approach with regard to a section of the envisaged grammar, viz word internal phenomena and relations between text units.

4.2 Word internal phenomena
4.2.1 Exploratory remarks
The grammar proper should start with the appropriate language phenomena—in Greek—on word internal level. The three most important semantic functions of words, are naming, marking and substituting, with naming the primary function (Nida & Wendland 1985:5-9). The principal naming classes are entities, events, abstracts, and relations, and these semantic classes can serve as an appropriate principle of division. The composition of this section could thus include the following:

1 Introduction
2 Naming words (Semantic classes)
   2.1 Objects
   2.2 Events
   2.3 Abstracts
   2.4 Relations
3 Marking words
4 Substituting words

The different ways in which Greek words are used for the particular function in the New Testament books should be treated under each of these semantic func-

---

7 E.g. the particle 'to' marks the infinitive phrase in 'to run is good for you.'
8 This is the phenomenon where one word is used as a substitute for another. Pronouns may substitute for entities (e.g. I, he, etc) or for events (e.g. The man did it).
9 E.g. 'hill', 'sun', etc.
10 E.g. 'converse', 'sing', etc. Events include states related to events, e.g. 'dead', 'tired', etc.
11 E.g. 'green', 'big', etc.
12 This includes spacial, temporal and logical relations, e.g. 'behind', 'when', 'therefore', etc.
tions. How this should be implemented in practice and the way in which the morphological characteristics of the parts of speech\textsuperscript{13} (e.g., noun, verb, adverb, etc.) of each word are to be accounted for, should still be determined through further research.\textsuperscript{14} The information in the following table can be utilised in this regard. The table takes as its point of departure the morphological word classes, and lists the five families\textsuperscript{15} with the morphological word classes of each family in the left hand column, the morphological features of each family in the middle column, and the function of each family in the right hand column:

### THE MORPHOLOGICAL WORD CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morphological word classes</th>
<th>Morphological features</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relation words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Prepositions, e.g., εἰς</td>
<td>Not conjugable and not declinable</td>
<td>Mark the relation between words, word groups, and sentences and paragraphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Conjunctions, e.g., γάρ</td>
<td>Not conjugable and not declinable</td>
<td>Qualify nomina or verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Adverbs, e.g., καλός</td>
<td>Declinable; forms designate gender, case and number</td>
<td>Fulfil different syntactic functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Qualificational particles, e.g., δὴ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Nouns, e.g., ἄριστος</td>
<td>Declinable; forms designate gender, case and number</td>
<td>Fulfil different syntactic functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Pronouns, e.g., ἀνιῶς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Adjectives, e.g., καλός, -ή, -όν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 (In-) transitive verbs, e.g., λεύ</td>
<td>Conjugable; forms designate person, number, tempus, modus and voice</td>
<td>Function as verbs of propositions and sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Copulative verbs, e.g., εἰμι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal nouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Infinitives, e.g., (τὸ) λάβειν</td>
<td>Declinable and conjugable; forms designate number, gender and case, and tempus, mode and voice</td>
<td>Fulfil a variety of syntactic functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Participle, e.g., (ὁ) λαμβανόμενος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{13} Traditionally these classes are referred to as 'parts of speech'. Linguistically speaking it is, however, more correct to refer to them as morphological word classes, especially from the Greek point of view.

\textsuperscript{14} Stanley E. Porter's inaugural volume of the series *Studies in Biblical Greek* (Porter 1989), the first rigorous and thorough application of systemic linguistics to the verbal network of ancient Greek, can possibly serve as a matrix, not only for the verb, but also for the other morphological categories. After completing this paper I obtained the book *Verbal aspect in New Testament Greek* by Buist M. Fanning (1990), but have not studied it.

\textsuperscript{15} The concept 'family' is used, because of the resemblance with respect to morphological characteristics.
4.2.2 An illustration: Relation words

In the discussion of relations, the subdomains distinguished in the Louw-Nida Lexicon\textsuperscript{16} can be taken as grid. Only some of these subdomains will be applicable to relation words. For the sake of an overview all the subdomains are given in the following table:\textsuperscript{17}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Derivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cause and/or reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Concession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Attendant circumstanc es</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sequential addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Linkage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Equivalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Dissociation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Combinative relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Alternative relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Mediation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each possible relation, the different prepositions which mark that relation, could be discussed and demonstrated with an example. For example, four prepositions are used in the New Testament to mark the relation ‘Specification’, and the presentation in the grammar could be as follows:\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \texttt{k\textae: A marker of a specific element bearing a relation to something else—\textit{in relation to, with regard to, e.g.}}
\item \texttt{\textit{to\textsuperscript{u} ge\textsubscript{n}o\textsubscript{m}e\textsubscript{n}ou \textit{ek sp\textsubscript{e}r\textsubscript{m}a\textsubscript{t}os \textit{Da\textsubscript{n}i\textsubscript{d} k\textae: s\textsubscript{a}r\textsubscript{k}a (Rm 1:3)}}}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{16} Cf the subdomains in Domain 89: Relations (Louw & Nida 1988:1,777-796).
\textsuperscript{17} These categories still have to be tested. This could result in the addition or deletion of some possibilities.
\textsuperscript{18} The preposition is given first, followed by a definition of the applicable relation, possible English equivalents, an example from the Greek New Testament, and an English translation.
with regard to his body, being of the lineage of David (Louw-Nida 1988:1,778)

(2) ἐν: Marker of an area of activity which bears some kind of relation to something else—in, about, in the case of, with regard to e.g: ὁ δὲ θεὸς πλούσιος ὡμ ἐν ἐλέει (Eph 2:4)
God being rich in mercy (Louw-Nida 1988:1,778)

(3) περί: A marker of relation, usually involving content or topic—in relation to, with regard to, concerning, e.g:
ἀναβαίνειν...εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ περί τοῦ ζητήματος τούτου (Ac 15:2)
go up...to Jerusalem in relation to this question (Louw-Nida 1988:1,778)

(4) πρὸς: A marker of relation involving potential interaction—with regard to, with, between...and, e.g:
Ἡ τίς κολουσία φωτι πρὸς οκότος (2 Cor 6:14)
or what kind of fellowship can there be between light and darkness? (Louw-Nida 1988:1,778)

The starting point is therefore no longer the preposition itself as is the case in, amongst others, Blass-Debrunner-Funk (1961:110-124), but the different relations marked by prepositions.

To optimise the principle of ‘user-friendliness’, a table containing the following type of information could function as a kind of index:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Relation type</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ἀμα</td>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>2.14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ἄνα</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>2.11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ἄνευ</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Dissociation</td>
<td>2.15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ἄντι</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Cause/Reason</td>
<td>2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ἄπο</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Cause/Reason</td>
<td>2.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ἄτερ</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Dissociation</td>
<td>2.15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 διά</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Cause/Reason</td>
<td>2.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 εἰς</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>Result</td>
<td>2.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>2.7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Etcetera ...

24 χωρίσ Genitive Dissociation 2.15.1

The other group of words marking relation, viz conjunctions, could be discussed
in the same way.\footnote{Another possibility is to use the classification of meaningful relations between structures of Louw \textit{et al.} (1983:99-104) or, a slightly different model, the classification of Beekman \& Callow (1974:287-312). I experimented with this model in an article in \textit{Neotestamentica} 24 (1990:283-300). The results underscore the validity and feasibility of this approach.}

4.3 Relations between units of texts

In this section of the grammar the relations between units of texts should be dealt with, distinguishing between intra-sentence relations on the one hand, and relations between sentences and propositions on the other.

4.3.1 Intra-sentence relations

4.3.1.1 Consideration of existing model

Traditional syntactic distinctions are not functional for designating and describing relations within sentences, because the point of departure is generally not \textit{relations} but \textit{construction (of phrases)}\footnote{Influential scholars hold this view on syntax. De Saussure (1966:91), e.g. holds that syntax is the theory of the grouping of words. Bloomfield (1935:207) writes: ‘syntax includes the construction of phrases.’ Other scholars more or less sharing this viewpoint are Chomsky (1957:11), Nida \& Taber (1974:201), Stork \& Widdowson (1974:17), Goetjhus (1965:13), Smyth (1963:255), and Nunn (1938,xii).}. The focus falls on the words as units of organisation and not on relations. Although there are definitions of syntax which focus on the relation between the components of the utterance\footnote{Newman \& Nida (1973:313) state the following in this regard: ‘Syntax is the arrangement and interrelationships of words in phrases, clauses and sentences.’ The viewpoints of Robertson (1923:384), Funk (1977:68), Grabner-Haider (1974:13) and Mickelsen (1963:14) more or less resemble this statement.}, none of the approaches which implement these definitions spells out the types of relations which are discerned and therefore no grid is offered. The terminology used is derived from the traditional morphologically-based syntactic model, which does not designate relations, but rather the morphological word classes or at most morphological constructions.

The variations of \textit{phrase structure grammar}\footnote{These variations include the \textit{constituent analysis} of Bloomfield (1935), the \textit{string analysis} of Harris (1963), the \textit{systematic grammar} of M.A.K Halliday (Stork \& Widdowson 1974:97-100), the \textit{tagmemics} of K.L. Pike (Stork \& Widdowson 1974:97-100) and the \textit{stratificational grammar} of S.M. Lamb (Stork \& Widdowson 1974:100).} are also not functional as model, mainly because these endeavour to describe the structure of an utterance on the grounds of strictly non-semantic distinctions (cf Saumjan 1971:103).

The classic transformational model is also not practicable for the envisaged grammar, because this model is—as Deist (1978:264) remarked more than a decade ago—not interested in texts, but in single sentences, and especially in the interpretation and generation of new sentences. The fact that the transforma-
tional model does not work with language as *performance* but as *competence* and is interested in the generation of new sentences (cf. Snyman 1979:9), disqualifies this model for the grammar.

The colon approach of the (i a) South African Discourse Analysis in itself is also not applicable, because it does not designate relations in the first place, but denotes ‘independent grammatic constructions consisting of a noun piece and a verb piece (with possible qualifications)’ (Botha 1990:175; cf. Du Toit 1977).23 This approach is not interested in the relations of the components of the sentence, but in the different possible combinations of components in a text.

Charles Fillmore’s *Case Grammar* (1968) at first seems to be usable, because he works with the relational structure in utterances. However, he sees only the deep structure as a relational structure in which the noun pieces function in certain roles (cf. Du Toit 1991:12). Furthermore, it is not relations with which this model works, but the role which a specific surface structure noun piece fulfils in its deep structure.

4.3.1.2 Exploratory remarks

Some years ago I drafted a model for the distinction and designation of relations within sentences (cf. Janse van Rensburg 1984). Although this model is a ‘syntactic model’, it does not view syntax in the traditional way, but treats it as a syntactically-based semantic category. In this model the definition of a syntactic function focusses on the types of relations between the different components of a sentence24 (Janse van Rensburg 1984:17). Ten such syntactic functions are proposed. This model produces a grid of eight types of semantic intra-sentence relations:25

1. **Action** ⇔ **Actor**, e.g.: 
   - The man gives a book.
   - The man gives a book to a slave.
   - The man is a teacher.

2. **Action** ⇔ **Acted upon**, e.g.: 
   - The man gives a book.

3. **Action** ⇔ **Affected**, e.g.: 
   - The man gives a book.

4. **Linker** ⇔ **Named**, e.g.: 
   - The man is a teacher.

5. **Linker** ⇔ **Linked**, e.g.: 
   - The man is a teacher.

---

23 My own English translation; the original reads: *onafhanklike grammatikale konstruksie wat bestaan uit ‘n naamwoordstuk en ‘n werkwoordstuk (met moontlike inbeddinge).*

24 I am using ‘sentence’ in the same way as Poythress (1984:313-315). A sentence is simply a maximal clause, that is a clause not embedded in or modifying a still larger clause, together with the inter-sentence relational particle at its beginning. (Cf. Cotterell & Turner [1989:190] for a variety of definitions of ‘sentence’.)

25 These relations differ from the cases of the Case Grammar in as much as the relations are not assigned in the depth structure. The eight types of intra-sentence relations are assigned in the surface structure, without being morphologic-syntactic. They are, however, not purely semantic but syntactic-semantic. If the approach were purely semantic, it would have produced an indefinite number of types of relation, and consequently generalization would have been difficult or impossible.
These eight types of relation could serve as section headings for this part of the grammar. All the possible constructions in the Greek New Testament for each syntactic function could be collected, listed and discussed. For example, the possible Greek constructions for *Action* could be discussed, and then those for *Actor, Acted upon*, etcetera.

4.3.1.3 An Illustration
When, for instance, the possible Greek constructions for *Actor* are to be discussed, the presentation could be as follows: in the left hand column the morphological construction is mentioned, in the middle column an example from the Greek New Testament, and in the right hand column the English equivalent.

The possible constructions for the intra-sentence relation type ‘Actor’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Greek example</th>
<th>English equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Verb ending</td>
<td>μέλλετε ἀποθησοκεῖν</td>
<td>No equivalent (Rm 8:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Nouns</td>
<td>τὸ πνεῦμα ἰπέρευθυχάιει</td>
<td>The Spirit intercedes (Rm 8:26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Noun</td>
<td>οἱ μεγάλοι κατεξουσιάζουν αὐτῶν</td>
<td>The great ones are tyrants over them (Mt 20:25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Pronoun</td>
<td>οὐκ ἐστε ἐν σαρκὶ</td>
<td>You are not in flesh (Rm 8:9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Adjective</td>
<td>ὁ ἅγιος τὰ δόματα του θεού λαλεῖ</td>
<td>Whom God has sent speaks the words of God (Jn 3:34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Verbs</td>
<td>ὁ ἐραυνῶν τὰς καρδίας οὐ δεν</td>
<td>He who searches the heart knows (Rm 8:27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Rel pronoun + Ind verb</td>
<td>ὁ θεὸς τὰ δόματα του θεού λαλεῖ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etcetera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Meaning relations between sentences or propositions
4.3.2.1 Exploratory remarks
Certain existing models offer a useful grid of most of the possible types of relations between propositions. The classification of meaningful relations of Beekman & Callow (1974:287-312) and the one by Louw *et al* (1983:99-104) have much to offer. The grid proffered by Cotterell & Turner (1989:188-230) which,

---

26 This eighth type of relation is strictly speaking not a ‘relation’, because it is not related to any other component of the sentence; therefore the name “Unattached”.  
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according to the authors, is 'heavily dependent...on the Summer Institute of Linguistics manuals' (1989:205), is however the most promising. Its usefulness is *inter alia* due to the fact that it uses terms which traditionally have not been used for describing syntactic relations.

I propose the following grid, an adaption of the one presented by Cotterell & Turner, for this section of the grammar:

**MEANING RELATIONS BETWEEN SENTENCES OR PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 HEAD (\Leftrightarrow) ADDITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Chronological addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Sequential addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Simultaneous addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Non-chronological addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Alternative addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Conjoined addition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 HEAD (\Leftrightarrow) SUPPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Argument(^{27})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 Reason (\Leftrightarrow) Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Means (\Leftrightarrow) Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3 Means (\Leftrightarrow) Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4 Grounds (\Leftrightarrow) Conclusion(^{28})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5 Concession (\Leftrightarrow) Contra-expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6 Condition (\Leftrightarrow) Consequence(^{29})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Introduction (\Leftrightarrow) Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Orientee (\Leftrightarrow) Content (Head)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3 Setting (time, location, circumstance) (\Leftrightarrow) Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 Head (\Leftrightarrow) clarification (with restatement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.1 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Equivalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.2 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Amplification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.3 Generic (Head) (\Leftrightarrow) Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Clarification (without restatement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.1 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.2 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.4 Head (\Leftrightarrow) Contrast (cont on following p)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{27}\) The 'head' as well as the 'argument' could be any of the propositions listed in 2.1.1-2.1.6.

\(^{28}\) Cotterell and Turner (1989:212) discern Grounds \(\Leftrightarrow\) Conclusion and Grounds \(\Leftrightarrow\) Exhortation as two separate types of argumentation relations. To my mind this represents one type of relation; the 'conclusion' can be either a statement or an exhortation.

\(^{29}\) Cotterell and Turner (1989:213) argue convincingly that Condition \(\Leftrightarrow\) Consequence related kernels can occur in any of the other argumentation relations, as well as in the Condition \(\Leftrightarrow\) Consequence mode itself.
The different types of relations in this grid could serve as section headings for the grammar. All the possible constructions in the Greek New Testament for each type of relation should be listed and discussed. For example, under 2.1 the possible Greek constructions for the argumentation relation Reason $\Rightarrow$ Result could be discussed, followed by the relation Means $\Rightarrow$ Result, etc.

5 A POSSIBLE SCHEME FOR THE ENVISAGED GRAMMAR

The following could serve as working scheme for the envisaged reference grammar.

CHAPTER 1: THEORETICAL PREAMBLE

CHAPTER 2: WORD INTERNAL LANGUAGE PHENOMENA

2.1 Introduction
2.2 Naming words (Semantic classes)
   2.2.1 Objects
   2.2.2 Events
   2.2.3 Abstracts
   2.2.4 Relations
2.3 Marking words
2.4 Substituting words

CHAPTER 3: RELATIONS BETWEEN UNITS OF TEXT

3.1 Introduction
3.2 Intra-sentence relations

1 Action $\Rightarrow$ Actor
2 Action $\Rightarrow$ Acted upon
3 Action $\Rightarrow$ Affected
4 Linker $\Rightarrow$ Named
5 Linker $\Rightarrow$ Linked
6 Stipulation $\Rightarrow$ Action/Linker/Qualification
7 Qualification $\Rightarrow$ Actor/Acted upon/Affected/Named/Linked
8. Unattached
3.3 Meaning relations between sentences or propositions

1 HEAD ⇔ ADDITION
   1.1 Head ⇔ Chronological addition
      1.1.1 Head ⇔ Sequential addition
      1.1.2 Head ⇔ Simultaneous addition
   1.2 Head ⇔ Non-chronological addition
      1.2.1 Head ⇔ Alternative addition
      1.2.3 Head ⇔ Conjoined addition

2. HEAD ⇔ SUPPORT
   2.1 Head ⇔ Argument
      2.1.1 Reason ⇔ Result
      2.1.2 Means ⇔ Result
      2.1.3 Means ⇔ Purpose
      2.1.4 Grounds ⇔ Conclusion
      2.1.5 Concession ⇔ Contra-expectation
      2.1.6 Condition ⇔ Consequence
   2.2 Head ⇔ Orientation
      2.2.1 Introduction ⇔ Head
      2.2.2 Orienter ⇔ Content (Head)
      2.2.3 Setting (time, location, circumstance) ⇔ Head
   2.3 Head ⇔ Clarification
      2.3.1 Head ⇔ Clarification (with restatement)
         2.3.1.1 Head ⇔ Equivalence
         2.3.1.2 Head ⇔ Amplification
         2.3.1.3 Generic (Head) ⇔ Specific
      2.3.2 Head ⇔ Clarification (without restatement)
         2.3.2.1 Head ⇔ Manner
         2.3.2.2 Head ⇔ Comparison
         2.3.2.4 Head ⇔ Contrast

3 PARTIAL RELATIONS
   3.1 Comment
   3.2 Parenthesis

CHAPTER 4: RHETORIC, PRAGMATICS, NARRATOLOGY, EPISTEMOGRAPHY (etc)

6 FURTHER RESEARCH

In as far as the exploratory remarks on a methodology for a new reference grammar for the Greek New Testament are valid, the following specific research needs to be done (each reference in parenthesis indicates the section of
this article in which the relevant point is discussed).

6.1 The full implications for the grammar of the absence of homogeneity regarding the Greek of the different books of the New Testament should be determined and made explicit (cf 2.1).

6.2 The feasibility of including phonology in the grammar, and—if it is included—the way in which it should be done (cf 3.1.1), should be established.

6.3 Regarding the intra-word language phenomena: (1) The different ways in which words in the Greek New Testament books are used for a particular semantic function, should be treated. It should inter alia be determined how the morphological characteristics and features of parts of speech of each word are to be accounted for (cf 4.2.1).

6.4 Regarding the intra-word language phenomena: 2) Data should be collected with a view to the description of intra-word phenomena in the Greek New Testament, under the headings mentioned below. All facets regarding entities, events and abstracts should be researched; regarding relations a possible approach is suggested in 4.2.2. After the general approach has been established, the following could be treated as independent sections:

* Naming words: Objects
* Naming words: Events
* Naming words: Abstracts
* Naming words: Relations
* Marking words
* Substituting words

6.5 Regarding the grid for intra-sentence relations: All the possible constructions in the Greek New Testament for each relation should be found, listed and discussed (cf 4.3.1.2-3).

6.6 Regarding the grid for meaning relations between sentences or propositions: All the possible constructions in the Greek New Testament for each relation should be found, listed and discussed (cf. 4.3.2.1).

6.7 Appropriate models for the discussion of rhetorical, pragmatical, narratological and epistolographical phenomena in the Greek New Testament should be established and implemented.
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